

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

LANCE REBERGER,)	3:15-CV-0551-MMD (VPC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
vs.)	June 13, 2017
)	
MICHAEL KOEHN, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. COOKE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: LISA MANN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Plaintiff's motion for the court to accept his errata with his signature page (ECF No. 79) to his motion to strike is **GRANTED**. However, the court's order denying plaintiff's motion to strike (ECF No. 84) remains in full force and effect.

Plaintiff's motion for a more definite statement from defendants' answer to second amended complaint (ECF No. 86) is **DENIED**. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e) provides that "a party may move for a more definite statement of a pleading to which a responsive pleading is allowed. . . ." A response to an answer is not permitted under the rules. Therefore, plaintiff may not move for a more definite statement of defendants' answer.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DEBRA K. KEMPI, CLERK

By: _____/s/_____
Deputy Clerk